Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/881,019	KANURI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ian N. Moore	2616
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Ian N. Moore</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Brian Ledell</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>6 April 2006</u>	Time: <u>1:41 PM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: USC 102 (b),(e)		
Claims discussed: 1 and 8		
Prior art documents discussed: Dobbins, Siddiqui		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
In N Mme		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Regarding appeal brief argument for clams 1 and 8, examiner disagrees with the applicant; but for claim 13, examiner agrees with the applicant.

Thus, examiner suggests applicant to include allowable subject matter of claim 13 into rejected claims 1 and 8 if he wishes to make this application in condition for allowance.

The applicant agrees. The applicant proposed and agreed amendment are set forth in examiner amendment.